

COMMUNICATIONS.

French Revolution--Volunteering--Gov. Briggs.

WORCESTER, MASS., 24th Feb., '47.

DEAR FRIENDS:--

"Forgotten Ohio"! No, never. Sorry am I, that you have had occasion to think so. "If I forget thee, O (Jeru) Salem, let my right hand forget her cunning." Are Ravensara, Austinburg, Jefferson and New Lyme in the North, Lloydsville, Somerton and Short Creek in the South, & New Garden, Youngstown and Salem between, are they so soon forgotten? Believe it not. High on the scroll of my loved ones, are the names of my dear friends there, and in other towns too. And while memory performs its wonted office, neither time nor distance shall invade the sacred registry.

But I have been whirled as in a tempest with engagements. Sickens kept me a month from the field. In that time "The Church as it is," was written, else I should sooner have been well. While in Boston, superintending the printing, I made my nightly sallies into the surrounding villages, and lectured generally to a late hour.

That of my hands, I accepted an invitation to lecture before a Lyceum that was desperate enough to apply to me to furnish them one of their course of lectures. I selected for my subject, "The Causes and Character of the French Revolution; with a view to rescue somewhat, that wonderful phenomenon from the horrible odium which European despots and their clinging minions, and more especially the spiritual and political demagogues of this country have screamed upon it."

The lecture caused me much study; but the reception it met with in the places where it has been delivered, was an ample compensation. The clergy have been croaking themselves hoarse in cursing the French Revolution, about long enough. It is time now to tell the world the truth about it. Society must keep drunk, slaves must shriek, war desolate the earth, the priest commit adultery, and the galleys, dragon-like, devour its victims, lest in ridding the world of such execrable curses, we revive the horrors of the French Revolution. Thus has the priesthood staved the advance of Reform. As if that Revolution, bad as it was, came any too soon, or was not ten thousand times more needful than ours of 1776--and in almost every sense, as honorable to humanity.

Such are a few of the reasons why my promise to the Bugle has not been better kept.

We are doing a great work in Massachusetts. Our numbers in the field are small, so many being in Britain and New York. The Boston Fair yielded, including a sale at New Bedford of some of the goods, more than 5000 dollars.

The people are growing more and more sick of politics and political parties. They have tried Whigism and found it more deceptive than the apples of Sodom--Democracy, and that too, is loathsome as adders, poison as asps--and Birneyism, but that combines all that is odious in both the other parties. So the converts to the doctrine of Disunion are daily multiplying.

Massachusetts has been trying to raise a regiment to go with the other plunderers and pirates to Mexico. Governor Briggs was the first to volunteer. He volunteered to raise the regiment, as soon as the government told him it would consent to accept of it, if men were big fools enough to leave better pay, to come. This was every particle of authority the governor had for his blundering course.

And the blunderhoodship was the least of the evil. Gov. Briggs had sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and he said this whole Texas proceeding was a gross violation of that Constitution. What business then, had he in violation of his oath, to support it, to be raising an army to trample it deeper in the dust? Is perjury so trifling an affair for Governors to commit?

He professed too, to be a very ardent champion of the Temperance cause. And yet he knows this banditti cannot be raised, only as the elements composing it, to a great extent, are drunk. And he knows that the strong inducements with many are, first, the hundred thousand gallons of whiskey, the very sink alops of Tophet, for which the government has just advertised, "for the use of the army," and second, the horrible riot they are allowed to make, on Mexican female chastity. He knows this, and yet exults them, Temperance champion as he is.

Gov. Briggs also calls himself a Christian!! He says he has followed his Lord down to the Jordan of baptism. Monthly he celebrates his dying compassion in sacramental feast. He reads, and says he loves his precepts, "Love your enemies--do good to them that hate you." But he loves the Mexicans, who are not his enemies, even, by sending his blasphemous myrmidons to chop them to pieces. He "does good to them that" do not "hate" him, by sacking their towns, plundering their plantations, violating their wives and daughters, and seizing on their lands. This is the virtue, the temperance, the Christianity of Gov. Briggs.

But after all, they cannot yet raise that one regiment. They have gone from New Hampshire to Maine, and Beersheba to Dan. They even picked up one whole company of poor Irish vagrants. They have raked the sinks and sewers for the boiled over scum, and set-

ted dregs of society. The ministers have preached and prayed at the volunteers, and the Boston Post has commended their pious zeal. The godly Olive Branch has implored and cursed the Chronotype and the anti-slavery papers that have discouraged enlistment. The Bible Society has given the soldiers bibles. The Tract Society distributed tracts. Some of the ladies, with immense pomp and circumstance, presented the Colonel a gold ring. Citizens have presented the officers with the most costly swords. Others have with immense solemnity, presented sergeants with six barreled revolvers, and corporals with Bowie knives. A mammoth Ball with five dollar tickets, was given in Faneuil Hall, in aid of the volunteers. Private subscriptions have flowed in by thousands for the same object. The Theatre, too, has lent its aid. A monstrous benefit was given under the direction of a large committee, last Friday night. The age or height of volunteers, is now no more a consideration than their character is or has been. Such are but a portion of the means the state and church have used, to baptize and sanctify volunteering in this daring crusade against justice, liberty, and humanity, and yet the regiment lacks hundreds of being full--so at least I am told. So is God defeating the counsels of the wicked. But I will tell you more about it next time.

Yours, dear friends, as ever,

PARKER PILLSBURY.

Frederick Douglass.

This chattel, who has converted himself into a man, and become one of the most effective advocates of human rights, and one of the most powerful pleaders for the redemption of his enslaved brethren, has permitted himself to be purchased, and received a bill of sale entitling him to the ownership of his own flesh and blood. What do ye think of it, Abolitionists! Has he compromised his high position? Has or will his influence be lessened by that act? Will it have the effect of Delilah's shears upon his strength? The principle involved in this proceeding is an important one, worthy the attention of all Abolitionists.

Though it has been considered as a settled question, that purchasing a slave is acknowledging the right of property in human beings, looting off a branch of the evil tree and leaving the means of replacing it with another, instead of devoting our means to blows at its root, yet the indications are that it will have to be settled again, when Frederick Douglass permits himself to be bought, and William Lloyd Garrison and other prominent Abolitionists justify the transaction. It is true that the circumstances in which he was placed were trying, and all admit that circumstances govern the rightfulness of actions sometimes. Inexorable necessity may compel us to do things that we otherwise would not. But what necessity was there for Douglass being bought? No Southern kidnapper had with quadruped and biped bloodhounds come in pursuit of him. If Thomas Auld or some other man had him in his possession, and was going to carry him to the South, but offered to loose his hold upon him on receiving 750 dollars, there would be some excuse for paying it; but such was not the fact. And in what way has his condition been bettered? When he returns to the United States he will be just as liable to be kidnapped as before. The only purpose for which his owner could wish to have him in his power would be to make an example of him to terrify other slaves, and destroy his influence at the North. And if he is determined to have him, he will go up to Boston and steal him, as some Kentuckians came up and stole Jerry Phinney from the capital of Ohio.

I am not surprised that the English should purchase Douglass. They are accustomed to buying slaves. They bought 800,000 in the West Indies with £20,000 wrong from their laboring classes at home; and I think it would have been far better to have devoted the £150, with which they ransomed Douglass who was already free, to relieving Ireland's starving millions. But I am surprised that Frederick should consent to be bought of his former master, when I remember an incident that occurred at an anti-slavery convention in Mt. Pleasant which he attended three years ago last October. A colored woman came to that convention to solicit money to purchase her son who was yet in slavery. Elisha Bates made a very pathetic appeal in her behalf, and the sympathies of the meeting were becoming very much excited. But when some one was about to make a move for taking up a collection for her, Frederick Douglass stood upon the pulpit steps, and amid the tears and sobs of that slave mother, objected to money being appropriated to such a purpose. "For," said he, "it will be acknowledging the right of property in human beings. The money that is paid for that mother's son will probably be taken to purchase some other mother's son, and it will only tend to extend and strengthen the traffic in slaves. Upon this principle we may purchase all the slaves in the South, while the slaveholders would only procure a fresh supply from Africa, and the system would still continue in all its horrors; whereas, if we expend our money in making well-directed blows at the root of the system, it will soon be overthrown and abolished forever." How has he escaped his own reasoning, I am not able to see.

J. McMillan.

Salem, February 21, 1847.

The Duty of Citizens.

FRIENDS JONES:--

The question of duty growing out of our Governmental relations has long been a matter of deep interest to me. Some of the anti-slavery friends, whose devotedness and conscientiousness I highly respect, eschew our National Constitution as a compact with Satan, and denounce all who acknowledge its authority as doers of evil. Others, who acknowledge the imperfection of the Constitution, think it their duty to act as citizens of the Nation, believing thereby they can effect greater general good. The question at issue between the Disunionist and the politician is in substance this--"Is it the duty of all who have a right to vote, to exercise that right judiciously under the present Constitution?"

I claim to have given this subject as deep and candid an investigation as I am capable of, and have been forced to the conclusion that it is my duty, with judgment and discrimination, to exercise this right--to vote under the present Constitution. Could I find that by so doing I give my support to slavery, to war, or to any other system of wickedness, my opinion, and of course my action, must change.

That we can exert a stronger influence against slavery and war by voting than by not voting, seems to me clear. A man's political influence is in proportion to his political power, all other things being equal. Thus, the President of the United States has more political power than any other man in the Nation, and his political influence is greater than that of any other man--his character, mental abilities being equal to the character and abilities of any other man. The Vice President may be supposed next in order of political influence, and so on down to the voter; and the voter can and does have a greater political influence than the man who has not a right to vote, or the non-voter.

The following will give force to the truth of this position. Some years since a number of Scotch families settled in Washington co., O. Their intelligence and morals were as good as that of their American neighbors, yet they were despised, and politically without influence, because they were aliens; but in time they availed themselves of the right of citizenship and took their place among a self-governing people. Politicians soon discovered that there was a new element in the body politic--a fine lot of Scotch, enough to turn the election. "How will the Scotch vote?" said a Whig to a leading Scotchman, "Whig or Democrat?" "The Scotch will go for that party that goes for them," replied the Scotchman. I scarcely need add that the Scotch did not now lack political influence, but were looked upon by politicians as a band of voters worthy of, and commanding respect. From all of which I infer that our political influence is in proportion to our political power, all other things being equal.

But do we retain our political power when we pledge ourselves not to exercise it? What would be the effect if the President of the United States should pledge himself not to exercise the powers conferred on him by his office, if there was no law to supply his place by another I cannot say. But the effect of such a pledge by a member of Congress would be to make one less effective supporter of his principles when a vote was to be taken on an act in which his principles were involved. He could exert no more influence than a person not having the power conferred upon him, and the effect would be about the same as if he had resigned his office. And such would be the effect of a similar course in a member of any corporate body organized in like manner, even down to the voter. By pledging himself not to use his political power, he in effect resigns that power, and with that his political influence as has been before shown. That a non-voter has some indirect political influence no one doubts, but that this influence cannot be made so efficient by a person not in possession of political power as by one that is, is a truth that might easily be shown.

It next remains to be shown that we may rightfully exercise political power, accept office, or vote under our present Constitution; which I will endeavor to do in another number.

WM. HEALD.

New Garden, Feb. 28, 1847.

FRIENDS JONES:--

Having observed in the Bugle one or two notices of commendation of the American House kept by Isaac Webb of this place; and as Anti-Slavery men generally prefer patronizing temperance houses, I deem it my duty to them and to the public, to state the following occurrence that illustrates the treatment those may expect at the hands of Isaac Webb, who may happen to differ with him in opinion.

While J. W. Walker was holding meetings in Salem, I was sitting in Webb's bar-room, hearing a discussion against the abolitionists by an ex-slaveholder and others. Webb turned to me and asked if I was not one of them, and if so, I was an infidel. I answered that I was, and that it constituted an infidel I supposed I was one. He thereupon told me that he did not want any one holding such sentiments about his house.

Should Webb carry out toward others the principle he manifested toward me, if any one should attempt to stop at his house he would meet them on the threshold with the question, are you an abolitionist!--if you are, you are an infidel, and can't stop here.

HAMMOND THOMAS.

Salem, Feb. 24th, '47.

2d Baptist Church.

FRIENDS EDITORS:--

An allusion is made at most of the anti-slavery meetings to the cause of the division of the Baptist Church in this place in 1840. It is generally supposed that the division was on the slavery question, which is undoubtedly a great mistake.

The undersigned was then a member and attended all the meetings of discipline, and can affirm that abolitionism was never agitated save at one meeting, and then a prominent member offered a resolution worded thus: "Resolved, that abolition be put out of the Church." This was lost by a good majority. The same brother who offered this used all his ability after the division to prejudice his retained brethren and the public against the separatists, by urging the slavery question as the great primary cause, and thereby exciting a sympathy in the breasts of the pro-slavery churches in his favor.

The leaders of the separatists subsequently used the same means to create an interest in their favor. The fact is, these were merely expedients. The difficulty began and ended in a conflict for the pre-eminence between a few of the separatists and the person who offered the above resolution.

Any person acquainted with the members at that time can easily perceive that some of the best anti-slavery sentiment remained in the old church, while at the same time some of the most confirmed pro-slavery members seceded and were attached to the new church. My word for it, Mr. Bugle, there is much better anti-slavery feeling in the old church than in the new. The good book says--"There is more hope of a fool than a hypocrite." The old members are honest in reference to this subject, and are making a slow but healthy progress; but the new seized an opportunity to aggrandize themselves by a deceptive use of the name of anti-slavery. They, to be sure, engrafted an anti-slavery article into their creed, but soon after received into the church persons notable for their pro-slavery. What did they care for the slave when their real purpose was to increase their numbers and power--to pull down their brethren on the opposite side of the way! I heard a worthy official on Saturday night proclaim himself wonderfully well pleased with free discussion; this same good brother some time since offered a resolution in the church for my exclusion if I did not promise to cease the advocacy of the articles of the fraternity.

Indeed, this Church was conceived in sin and born in iniquity. It is an illegitimate child, and no act of legislation can be obtained to legalize it.

ENOS ELDRIDGE.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, MARCH 5, 1847.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it--the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."--Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chesnut sts.

"Comeoutism and Comeouters."

We designed referring long ere this to an article which appeared in the Oberlin Quarterly for Nov., bearing the above caption, and emanating from James A. Thome, but other matters more important has prevented its notice until now. The fact that a "Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in Oberlin Collegiate Institute" should deem it worth while to devote a long and labored article to the demolition of Comeoutism, is certainly cheering evidence of the progress of its principles. It is not our intention to attempt an answer, but merely notice a few points which seem to claim especial attention. The article, for aught we know, may be very logical in construction, but to our mind it appears to be a sad intermixture of truth and error, of sound reasoning and ingenious sophistry. The author in the commencement states nine propositions which refer mainly, if not entirely to the relation which truth and light sustain toward each other. In order that he may not be misapprehended, and to let the entire world understand what he means by Comeoutism, and what kind of Comeoutism he wishes to destroy at this particular time, he enumerates the different varieties, and then dashes off a sketch of what he calls anti-slavery Comeoutism--giving its character under seven heads. He declares,

1st. The religion of the Comeouters, which is one of their own fabrication, is based upon two commandments which enjoin supreme love for the slave, and supreme hatred for the slaveholder.

We are loath to believe he made this assertion knowing it to be false, yet are certain he had not the least vestige of proof to sustain it, for Comeouters have uniformly shown they were actuated by the kindest motives toward the slaveholder, a desire to emancipate him as well as his bondmen--to benefit the oppressor as well as the oppressed. The evident tendency of such an unfounded and reckless assertion, is to embitter the slaveholder against the anti-slavery Comeouters, and enkindle, if they have not before been lighted, the lurid fires of hellish hatred in his bosom. Thus does James A. Thome bear false witness against his neighbor.

2nd. That they believe slavery to be the sum of all villainies--the sin which embraces all other sins.

This he does not deny, yet in his argument labors most zealously to prove that he who is guilty of slaveholding is not necessarily implicated in the sin of slavery.

3rd. That it has defiled the entire people--that sects and parties have become tainted by it--that it has corrupted the religion of the North as well as of the South--that it is, so far as this nation is concerned, an almost universal sin.

This appears to us a plain proposition, and one which all will assent to who know how slavery depraves a nation, and who are conscious that when one member suffers, all suffer.

4th. That the character of the slaveholder is to be determined by the character of the relation he sustains.

We do not suppose the community will find in this doctrine, anything particularly objectionable, inasmuch as society is accustomed to determine the character of the murderer by the relation he sustains to the murdered man, of the robber by the relation he sustains toward the one whom he robs. It does not, however, follow that society, because it regards all murderers as murderers, sees no deeper guilt in one than in another; nor is it true, as the author asserts, that Comeouters must adopt the conclusion he falsely draws from their premises, that "all slaveholders are of the same hue of guilt." They do not aspire to estimate accurately the degree of guilt attached to the slaveholder; that is known only to Him who is acquainted with the heart, and measures the strength of every temptation that besets it, of every trial that assails it; still less do they declare that all are alike guilty, for the intellect which God has given them, teaches that he who sins against light commits a more grievous wrong than he who errs through ignorance.

Another *ergo* which he hangs upon the 4th proposition, and which seems to shock his benevolence very much is, that "the best slaveholder that can be found or fancied, is a liar, a thief, an adulterer, a pirate and a murderer." If slavery, which asserts that the mortal image of the immortal God is property, be a lie, then is the slaveholder a liar--if it is a system of theft, theft of the most terrible description, then the slaveholder is a thief--if it makes merchandise of woman's virtue, if it receives the price of her prostitution and systematizes adultery, then the slaveholder is an adulterer--if it robs man of his dearest rights, if with pirate hand it tears from him the last vestiges of humanity, then is the slaveholder a pirate--if it destroys not only the body by its lingering tortures or more speedy vengeance, but takes the spiritual life of its victim, then is the slaveholder a murderer. James A. Thome himself endorses these premises, but repudiates the conclusions. Speaking of the system he says:--

"It comprehends theft, falsehood, licentiousness of every form, (as adultery, incest, rape, seduction and virtual polygamy,) piracy, violation of every interest, abrogation of the marriage institution, heathenism, despotism, war, denial of the scripture doctrine of human brotherhood, profanation of the Bible, desecration of the Sabbath, rebellion against God, treason against liberty, and wholesale murder."

And yet he endeavors to separate the sinner from the sinful act, the system from its supporters, and while condemning slavery, throws the mantle of charity over multitudes of slaveholders. Hear him on this point.

"Something then is necessary beside the fact of owning slaves to constitute a man guilty of the sin of slavery; he must be a slaveholder in heart as well as in fact, and the latter may not always be a proof decisive of the former. * * * Is it not supposable that a man may hold slaves without once dreaming he is converting a fellow being into property? * * * A man may hold slaves and have ample light pertaining to slavery; he may not only fully understand its outrageous wickedness, but he may abhor it most heartily, yet he may under peculiar circumstances hold slaves, and not thereby be implicated in the sin of slavery."

Well may the writer feel the necessity of disclaiming his intention of "weaving an ingenious apology for the slaveholder," for we fear that many would otherwise so regard it. He declares that a man may own slaves without being guilty of slavery, or may hold them without designing to convert them into property, or while understanding the true character of slavery, while comprehending the height and depth, the length and breadth of its iniquity, may hold slaves and not be implicated in the guilt of slavery! The Professor appears exceedingly anxious to shoot the hydrophobia while he lets the mad dog run unmoled. His positions will undoubtedly give great "aid and comfort" to the slaveholders, for if tried by them there is scarcely one in the land who will feel condemned. This mode of separating the system from its supporters is not an invention of James A. Thome, it is the plan which has long since been adopted by those churches who "are as much as ever opposed to the evil of slavery," and yet retain in full communion those who are engaged in supporting it. If we substitute another sin for that of slavery in the declaration last quoted, the fallaciousness of the doctrine upon which they are based will perhaps be made more striking than they could by argument. Take for instance adultery, which is certainly of itself a crime of less magnitude than slaveholding.

"Something then is necessary beside the fact of committing adultery to constitute a man guilty of the sin of adultery; he must be an adulterer in heart as well as in fact, and the latter may not always be a proof de-

cisive of the former. * * * Is it not supposable that a man may commit adultery without once dreaming that he is converting a woman into an adulteress! * * *

A man may commit adultery and have ample light pertaining to it, he may not only fully understand its outrageous wickedness, but he may abhor it most heartily, yet he may under peculiar circumstances commit the act, and not thereby be implicated in the sin."

It may be said that the passages we have quoted, by being detached from their original connection, misrepresent the views of the author. We suppose the Professor did not design to make so unfortunate an application--unfortunate for himself--as may legitimately be made; but after stating his proposition, after declaring his doctrine, he may be assured that his application of it will not always accompany the presentation of the principle.

We freely admit that in the connection in which we found them, they would not appear so odious to a casual observer as in the position we have placed them; but they were none the less objectionable, none the less dangerous because their deformity was partially concealed, because--to use an illustration of the author--the arsenic was involved in a glass of lemonade.

The remaining heads in his character of anti-slavery comeoutism may be briefly summed up as follows:--

5th. That the slave claimants are not the real slaveholders, but that these are to be found at the North.

6th. That the church and clergy are a brotherhood of thieves.

7th. That abolitionists should hold no connection with pro-slavery churches.

We would not have our readers suppose that we have given the language of his description, or even the substance of all he says. We but give the leading thought of each of his seven heads, all of which, as we have stated them are correct in description except the first, but in his delineation there is so much poetry, so much amplifying, so much illustration and embellishment, so many flights of fancy, so many touches of rhetoric, that we must beg to be excused from acknowledging the portrait a just one. Had we space, and did we deem it worth our while, we would point out the many misrepresentations with which it abounds.

The most of the author's strength is expended in combating the 4th and 7th points, for the destruction of these is necessary to the accomplishment of the end he has in view; and the 7th depends greatly on the 4th, for if slavery is the sum of all villainies, is anti-Christian in its character, and every slaveholder is guilty of slavery, we see not how the conclusion is to be avoided that christian abolitionists are bound to refuse church fellowship to slaveholders and pro-slavery churches. But more upon this point at another time.

CILLEY'S SPEECH.--Let it should be said by some of our readers, or by some who are not our readers, that we have misrepresented the views of this Senator in regard to the Mexican war by quoting his reported speech from the National Intelligencer rather than from the National Era--which latter paper, by the way, we had not received when we wrote the article concerning him--we this week give it entire as corrected by himself. Were it not that we desired to have the Colonel speak in his own language we should not occupy our columns with it, for we do not think the inculcation of such sentiments as it contains, will purify the morals of the people, nor quicken their perceptions of justice.

"I look to our own comfort." There is philanthropy for you--there is enlarged benevolence! "I hope nothing I have said will be considered as rendering aid to the enemy, for that is not my desire." Oh, no! Though the Mexicans are fighting for freedom, and the Americans for slavery--though the former are contending for the sanctity of their hearth-stones and for the preservation of their altars, while the latter are striving to destroy both, Colonel Cilley does not desire to aid the enemy; but on the contrary, if Mexico will not treat without more fighting, he exclaims, "STRIKE AT THE HEAD!" What wonderful love of justice! What sympathy for the injured! What striking abolitionism! He thinks peace "can be obtained as well with our army in our own country, until we may have time to have them properly organized and drilled, and have some plan of operation," as to continue them in Mexico; and then, when the government has withdrawn its troops this side the Rio Grande, when it has increased the army, when the soldiers are well drilled, when they have become inured to service, and all according to the plan proposed by Colonel Cilley, if it is found necessary to make other hostile demonstrations, he thinks the government would be prepared to strike "such a blow as would have the desired effect."

Why after such a speech--and we hope all our readers will peruse it carefully--would it be much wonder if the Democracy should buzz for Polk, Texas and Cilley?

Our friends will be glad to learn by this week's Bugle, that Parker Pillsbury has resumed his pen as one of our correspondents. His letters are looked for and read with great interest, and it is to be hoped that no circumstances will again occur to cause so long an interruption of his intercourse with our readers.

"THE LITTLE PILGRIM," on our fourth page, will be read with interest by all who are acquainted with the history of Bunyan's Christian Pilgrim.